



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/773,535

02/05/2004

Claude Singer

1662/62802

6797

26646 7590 07/14/2009
KENYON & KENYON LLP
ONE BROADWAY
NEW YORK, NY 10004

EXAMINER

MORRIS, PATRICIA L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1625

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/14/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 33-38, 42-45, 54 and 55 are under consideration in this application.

Claims 1-32, 39, 40 and 46-53 remain held withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to nonelected subject matter 37 CFR 1.142(b).

Election/Restrictions

The restriction requirement is deemed sound and proper and is hereby made FINAL.

The rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103 are hereby withdrawn in view of applicants's assertions in the instant response.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 33-38, 42-45, 54 and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Again, claims 33-35 are improper product by process claims. Again, original claim 41 demonstrates that applicants are able to describe the instant compound here without resorting to the process. Again, claims 33-35 are improper here. Contra to applicants' arguments in the instant response, product-by-process claims are not proper in the same application where it has been demonstrated that the compound in question may be described by means of a chemical structure. In re Hughes, 182 USPQ 106 (CCPA 1974).

Art Unit: 1625

Contra to applicants' arguments in the instant response, applicants are merely claiming a compound well known in the art and the process steps are merely conventional.

Again, no objective evidence has been presented that the compounds can only be produced by the process recited in the specification. Mere allegations by counsel do not take the place of any objective evidence.

Again, the expression "containing" in claims 42 and 43 is open-ended and allows for the inclusion of other parameters not contemplated by applicants. Contra to applicants' allegations, the term containing is not permitted in compound claims.

Again, claim 45 lacks antecedent basis for the recited limitations. Contra to applicants assertions in the instant response, there is no basis at all for six months in claim 45. Again, claim 44 recites only three months. Applicants have failed to amend the claims to overcome the rejection.

The claims measure the invention. United Carbon Co. V. Binney & Smith Co., 55 USPQ 381 at 384, col. 1, end of 1st paragraph, Supreme Court of the United States (1942).

The U.S. Court of Claims held to this standard in Lockheed Aircraft Corp. v. United States, 193 USPQ 449, AClaims measure invention and resolution of invention must be based on what is claimed.

The C.C.P.A. in 1978 held a that invention is the subject matter defined by the claims submitted by the applicant. We have consistently held that no applicant should have limitations of the specification read into a claim where no express statement of the limitation is included in the claim. In re Priest, 199 USPQ 11, at 15.

Art Unit: 1625

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 33-38, 42-45, 54 and 55 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6 and 29-38 of copending Application No. 10/717,325 in view of view of Haleblan et al., Chemical & Engineering News, US Pharmacopia, Muzaffar et al., Jain et al., Taday et al., Brittain et al. and Concise Encyclopedia Chemistry for the reasons set forth in the record.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Again, a terminal disclaimer has not been received too date.

Conclusion

No claim is allowed.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 1625

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patricia L. Morris whose telephone number is (571) 272-0688. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays through Fridays.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Patricia L. Morris/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1625

plm
July 13, 2009

Application/Control Number: 10/773,535

Page 6

Art Unit: 1625